

MEMORANDUM

TO: Town of Lexington Planning Board

FROM: Peter Tamm and Chase Johnson

CC: Bradley Cardoso and Joshua Hill

DATE: February 11, 2022

SUBJECT: Preliminary Site Development and Use Plan PD-6 – Response to Zoning

Comments from Planning Board during February 2, 2022 Public Hearing

In response to certain comments relating to the proposed zoning and regulatory plans from the Town of Lexington Planning Board during the February 02, 2022 Public Hearing related to the Preliminary Site Development and Use Plan: PD-6, we offer the following responses for your consideration. Please find below a summary of the comment received followed by a response.

1) Comment: The regulatory plans should include the existing buildings at 95 Hayden Avenue.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner is updating the regulatory plan set to provide further details as well as elevations of the existing buildings that will remain upon both 99 Hayden Avenue and at 95 Hayden Avenue

2) Comment: Consider expanding the permitted uses to include appropriate uses which are not currently contemplated by the project, but that could be sought in the future for any imagined use of the property.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text accordingly.

3) Comment: Consider adding convenience uses, solar uses, food uses, and parking as principal uses rather than as accessory uses.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text accordingly.

- 4) Comment: Consider permitting wireless communications subject to the restrictions in §6.4 (Wireless Communication Facilities) of the Zoning Bylaw.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The PSDUP Zoning text allows concealed wireless communication facilities as permitted pursuant to §6.4 of the Zoning Bylaw.
- 5) Comment: Consider updating the uses terminology to conform with that used in the current use table.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text accordingly.
- 6) Comment: N/A for certain dimensional standards should be changed because those dimensional standards are applicable. Consider changing N/A to NR or 0 ft.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text. The Petitioner will also update the regulatory plans accordingly.
- 7) Comment: Confirm the maximum site coverage figure included in the dimensional standards.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner has reviewed the site coverage figure and has increased the maximum site coverage figure in the PSDUP Zoning text. The Petitioner will also update the regulatory plans accordingly.
- 8) Comment: Review the proposed buildings' required height including all rooftop structures, and consider increasing the maximum rooftop structure height as needed.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text. The Petitioner will also update the regulatory plans accordingly.
- 9) Comment: Consider explicitly indicating that the definition of building height provided in 7.2 of the PSDUP Zoning text excludes all rooftop structures.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text accordingly.
- 10) Comment: Review the number of parking spaces permitted by the PSDUP and ensure that this will meet all future parking demand.
 - Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner agrees and has updated the PSDUP Zoning text accordingly.

11) Comment: Specify how the parking design standards will be addressed, in light of the PSDUP Zoning being exempt from §5.1.13 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Response: Comment acknowledged. The Petitioner has updated the PSDUP Zoning text to specify that the parking design standards for dimensions, snow storage, and electrical vehicle charging typically set forth in 5.1.13 of the Zoning Bylaw will be established in the course of site plan review in accordance with process and requirements set forth by the Planning Board.